

REMARKS

Claims 1-19, 21, 23-25, 27-29 are pending in the application, of which claim 1 is independent.

Claim 29 has been objected to due to the use of an improper identifier. Accordingly, claim 29 has been cancelled, rendering this objection moot. New claim 30 is directed to the subject matter originally claimed in claim 29.

Claims 1, 9, 11, and 28 to 29 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) in view of Winans US Patent Application Publication 2002/0173354. This rejection is respectfully traversed at least for the following reasons.

Winans does not teach or suggest that the substrate includes both a metal layer and an upper substrate layer comprising a material selected from the group consisting of a plastic layer, a polymer layer and a dielectric layer, as recited in claim 1. Instead, Winans teaches at paragraph [0119] that the substrate may be either an optically-clear plastic film or a reflective metal foil, but does not teach a combination thereof.

Moreover, Winans does not teach or suggest that the metal layer and the upper substrate layer of the substrate are disposed to cause light, generated as a result of electroluminescence and directed toward the metal layer through the upper substrate layer, to be reflected back to the semi-transparent upper electrode layer, so to enhance the light output from the flexible organic light emitting device. On the contrary, Winans teaches at paragraph [0120] that an OLED cell structure that is transparent and emits light through the top cathode layer 454 may be used on top of opaque substrates such as metal, foils and wood that may form the exterior surface of a gaming machine.

It is further submitted that a person of ordinary skilled in the art would find no reason from the disclosure of Winans to produce Applicant's invention, because Winans' disclosure of using a reflective metal foil as a substrate would be seen as degrading the quality of the light output from the flexible organic light emitting device, given that the reflective metal foil would be understood to contribute to reflection of ambient incident light back to the viewer, making the light emitting device less readable. In fact, Winans teaches away from Applicant's invention by stating at paragraph [0120] that an OLED cell structure that is transparent and emits light

through top cathode layer 454 may be used on top of opaque substrates such as metals, foil or wood surface of a gaming machine.

Claims 1, 2-8, 12-13, 15 and 23-24 have rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Mishima US Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0178937 in view of Weinans. It is respectfully submitted that neither Mishima nor Weinans, alone or in combination, teach that the metal layer and the upper substrate layer of the substrate are disposed to cause light, generated as a result of electroluminescence and directed toward the metal layer through the upper substrate layer, to be reflected back to the semi-transparent upper electrode layer so to enhance light output from the flexible organic light emitting device.

The Office Action has acknowledged that Mishima fails to provide the above teaching. The deficiencies of Mishima are not filled by Weinans, for the same reasons as discussed with reference to claim 1.

It is submitted that claims 2-8, 12-13, 15 and 24 are patentable over the cited references for the same reasons as claim 1 and the additional limitations contained therein. For example, neither Mishima nor Weinans, alone or in combination, teach an interfacial modified surface of the anode as recited in claim 2, nor a modification of the surface of the anode, in particular, with inorganic or organic materials or a TCO, as recited in claim 3.

Claims 16, 19, 21 and 27 are further believed patentable at least for the same reasons as the claims, from which each of claims 16, 19, 21 and 27 respectively depends.

Conclusion

It is believed that the present application is in condition for consideration and allowance. If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this and concurrent replies to charge payment (or credit any overpayment) to Deposit Account No. 50-2298 of Luce, Forward, Hamilton & Scripps LLP for any additional required fees.

Respectfully submitted,

September 8, 2008
Date

/Franco A. Serafini/
Franco A. Serafini
Registration No. 52,207
Attorney for Applicants

LUCE, FORWARD, HAMILTON & SCRIPPS LLP
11988 El Camino Real, Ste. 200
San Diego, California 92130
Telephone No.: (858) 720-6300

701024874